



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,295	10/02/2000	Mathias Entenmann	35901.3	4137
27683 7590 06/21/2010 HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP Section 2323 Victory Avenue Suite 700 Dallas, TX 75219				
EXAMINER TRAN, HAI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3694				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/21/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2
3
4 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
5 AND INTERFERENCES
6

7
8 *Ex parte* MATHIAS ENTENMANN
9

10
11 Appeal 2009-012037
12 Application 09/678,295
13 Technology Center 3600
14

15
16 Decided: June 18, 2010
17

18
19 Before MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD, HUBERT C. LORIN, and
20 ANTON W. FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judges*.
21 FETTING, *Administrative Patent Judge*.

22 DECISION ON APPEAL
23

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Mathias Entenmann (Appellant) seeks review under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) of a final rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32, the only claims pending in the application on appeal.

We have jurisdiction over the appeal pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

SUMMARY OF DECISION¹

We AFFIRM.

THE INVENTION

The Appellant invented a method of effecting cashless payments and a system for implementing the method (Specification 1:4-5).

An understanding of the invention can be derived from a reading of exemplary claim 1, which is reproduced below [bracketed matter and some paragraphing added].

1. A method of effecting a cashless payment transaction by means of a merchant station characterized by a merchant station identification code, a mobile cell phone with a SIM card characterized by an identification code identifying the SIM card, and a comparing device, which comprises a transaction data memory device, a merchant checking device for checking the identification codes of the merchant stations authorized for

¹ Our decision will make reference to the Appellant's Appeal Brief ("App. Br.," filed February 12, 2009) and the Examiner's Answer ("Ans.," mailed March 19, 2009), and Final Rejection ("Final Rej.," mailed February 4, 2008).

1 this method, and a subscriber checking device for checking the
2 identification codes of the SIM cards authorized for this method
3 and which is connected to account keeping device, comprising
4 the steps:

5 [1] reading an amount of money to be paid into the merchant
6 station,

7 [2] transmitting, by the merchant station, the identification
8 code of the merchant station and at least the amount of money
9 to the comparing device through a data link,

10 [3] checking the authority of the merchant station for the
11 method, using the merchant checking device,

12 [4] terminating the method in the absence of the authority,
13 otherwise writing the data as an open transaction into the
14 transaction memory device of the comparing device,

15 [5] after the step of reading the amount of money into the
16 merchant station, making a connection from the mobile cell
17 phone to the comparing device,

18 [6] transmitting the identification code of the merchant
19 station and the identification code associated with the SIM card
20 from the mobile cell phone to the comparing device,

21 [7] checking the authority of the SIM card for the method,
22 using the subscriber checking device, in the absence of the
23 authority terminating the method, clearing the open transaction
24 from the transaction memory and the transmitting
25 corresponding data to the merchant station, otherwise
26 comparing the merchant station identification code transmitted
27 from the mobile cell phone with those of the open transactions
28 stored in the transaction memory device and on failure to find
29 such a transaction terminating the process and, on finding the
30 transaction,

31 [8] transmitting the transaction data to the mobile cell phone,

32 [9] outputting the data through the mobile cell phone,

33 [10] requesting confirmation information through the mobile
34 cell phone,

[11] transmitting the confirmation data to the comparing device,

[12] terminating the transaction and clearing the transaction from the transaction memory if the confirmation data corresponds to a refusal, and transmitting the transaction data from the transaction memory and the identification code of the mobile cell phone to an account keeping device and clearing the transaction from the transaction memory in the alternative case; and

[13] transmitting additional supplementary transaction data to the comparing device or mobile cell phone from the merchant station.

THE REJECTIONS

The Examiner relies upon the following prior art:

Partridge, III	US 5,608,778	Mar. 4, 1997
Jonstromer	US 6,142,369	Nov. 7, 2000

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Partridge and Jonstromer.

ISSUES

The issue in rejecting claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Partridge and Jonstromer turns on whether Partridge and Jonstromer describe the steps or elements recited in claim 1.

FACTS PERTINENT TO THE ISSUES

The following enumerated Findings of Fact (FF) are believed to be supported by a preponderance of the evidence.

Facts Related to the Prior Art

Partridge

01. Partridge is directed to wireless telephones and processes for use of such a telephone to secure action on behalf of the telephone's holder (Partridge 1:8-10).

02. Partridge describes a basic transaction in the system is for a cellular telephone to charge a chosen amount to its account with a credit center and to inform a merchant that they will get the benefit of this charging against the telephone holder's account (Partridge 3:18-22). First, a merchant provides a customer with a unique code that identifies the merchant to the credit center (Partridge 5:3-5). The customer presses, the merchant's code and the amount to be charged to the customer's account, into the phone and thereby credited to the merchant (Partridge 5:6-9). The cellular telephone transmits this data to a base station and the credit center (Partridge 5:10-23). The credit center determines whether the customer is in a position to receive credit (Partridge 5:23-28). If the customer is approved for credit, the credit center transmits an approval code to the merchant and customer (Partridge 5:29-32). Receipt of the approval confirmation completes the transaction (Partridge 5:33-34). The cellular phone transmits specific values to the credit center to request

confirmation of the transaction (Partridge 4:8-10). Alternatively, the merchant can contact the credit center and provide its identification code in order to avoid any miscommunication by the customer (Partridge 5:48-52). The customer and merchant can also use a transaction password (TP) and each submit the TP in contacting the credit center (Partridge 5:55-62).

03. Several values are transmitted between the merchant, the customer, the base station, and the credit center (Partridge Figs. 2-6). The transmitted information includes an equipment number (ESN), the cellular telephone's assigned number (MIN1), and possibly a transaction password (TP) (Partridge 3:40-48 and 5:55-57). The merchant code, the amount charged, and a prefix comprise the string MIN2 (Partridge 5:8-9). In one embodiment, the merchant only transmits the merchant ID code to the customer and the customer transmits all of the values to the base station and credit center (Partridge Fig. 2). In another embodiment, the customer transmits all of the information to the merchant and the merchant transmits all of the information to the base station and credit center (Partridge Fig. 4). Partridge further describes multiple variations of which devices are transmitting what information to other devices, including having both the customer and the merchant contact the base station and credit center with the same information so that the merchant and customer are matched to the same transaction (Partridge Figs. 3 and 5-6).

Jonstromer

04. Jonstromer is directed to an electronic wallet and a method of using an electronic wallet (Jonstromer 1:8-10).

05. Jonstromer describes an electronic transaction system that uses a smart card or subscriber information module (SIM) configured to store credits and a communication module configured to transmit credits from the smart card to a party (Jonstromer 1:28-30, 2:27-29, and Abstract).

ANALYSIS

*Claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
as unpatentable over Partridge and Jonstromer*

The Appellant first contends that (1) Partridge fails to describe the step of transmitting an amount of money from the merchant station, as required by limitation [2] of claim 1 (App. Br. 9). We disagree with the Appellant. Partridge describes a system where credit is extended to a cellular telephone customer and the customer can charge items to the cellular telephone account (FF 01-02). Partridge describes the transaction as beginning with the merchant transmitting the merchant ID to the customer (FF 02). In the embodiment argued by the Appellant, the customer then transmits the equipment number (ESN), the cellular telephone's number (MIN1), the merchant code and the amount to charge (MIN2) to the base station and the credit center (FF 02-03). The credit center compares the received transmission to authenticate and makes a determination to approve credit to

1 the customer (FF 02). That is, the credit center terminal is a comparing
2 device. However, Partridge further describes that the merchant can directly
3 contact the credit center in order to avoid any miscommunication by the
4 customer (FF 02). Partridge explicitly describes that the customer transmits
5 the ESN, MIN1, and MIN2 to the merchant and the merchant transmits these
6 values to the base station and credit center (FF 03). Since the MIN2 value
7 includes the amount to be charged, Partridge explicitly describes the
8 merchant transmitting an amount of money.

9 The Appellant additionally contends that (2) Partridge fails to describe
10 the step of transmitting the identification code from the merchant from both
11 the merchant station and the mobile cell telephone, as required by limitation
12 [6] of claim 1 (App. Br. 9-10). We disagree with the Appellant. As
13 discussed *supra*, both the customer and the merchant have can transmit the
14 MIN2 value (FF 02-03). As also discussed *supra*, the MIN2 value consists
15 of the merchant code and the amount due (FF 03). Therefore, the Partridge
16 explicitly describes from either the merchant or the cellular telephone of the
17 customer.

18 The Appellant further contends that (3) Partridge fails to describe the
19 steps of writing the data transmitted from the merchant station to an open
20 transaction and then comparing a merchant station identification code
21 transmitted from the mobile cell telephone with the open transaction to find
22 the transaction, as required by limitations [4] and [7] of claim 1 (App. Br.
23 10). The Appellant specifically argues that Partridge fails to describe the
24 merchant transmitting the merchant code and therefore there would be no
25 transmission of the merchant code from the merchant that is written to an
26 open transaction (App. Br. 10). We disagree with the Appellant. As

discussed *supra*, Partridge describes an embodiment where the merchant transmits the ESN, MIN1, and MIN2 values to the base station and credit center (FF 03). Partridge further describes an embodiment where the customer contacts the base station and credit center with the ESN, MIN1, and the MIN2 and the merchant also contacts the credit center with the ESN, MIN1, and MIN2 values (FF 03). This allows the credit center to determine whether to extend the credit and send approvals to the customer and merchant (FF 02). As such, Partridge describes the merchant transmitting the merchant ID with an open transaction.

The Appellant also contends that (4) Partridge fails to describe the steps of transmitting the transaction data to the mobile cell telephone and outputting the data through the mobile cell telephone, as required by limitations [8] and [9] of claim 1 (App. Br. 10). We disagree with the Appellant. First, the steps recited in claim 1 are not required to be performed in any specific order. As such, there is nothing precluding limitations [8] and [9] to be performed as the first steps of the method or the last steps of the method. Although the Examiner responds that the *confirmation* does not include transaction data (Ans. 11-12), there is nothing requiring these steps to be performed at the end of the transaction. Partridge describes that a customer keys in the merchant ID and the amount to be charged (FF 02). Partridge then describes that this data is transmitted to the merchant or the credit center (FF 02-03). That is, Partridge describes transmitting the transaction information or data to the cellular phone and then transmitting the transaction data to the merchant or credit center. As such, the Appellant's argument is not found persuasive.

1 The Appellant additionally contends that (5) Partridge fails to describe
2 the steps of requesting confirmation information through the mobile cell
3 telephone and transmitting the confirmation data, as required by limitations
4 [10] and [11] of claim 1 (App. Br. 11). We disagree with the Appellant.
5 Partridge explicitly describes that the cellular phone transmits values to the
6 credit center to request a confirmation (FF 02). Upon determination of
7 whether to approve credit to the customer, the customer cellular phone
8 receives a confirmation (FF 02). As such, Partridge describes requesting
9 confirmation information and transmitting confirmation data.

10 The Appellant further contends that (6) Partridge fails to describe the
11 step of transmitting additional supplementary transaction data from the
12 merchant station, as required by limitation [13] of claim 1 (App. Br. 11).
13 The Appellant specifically argues that Partridge fails to describe transmitting
14 transaction data, as argued *supra*, and therefore fails to describe transmitting
15 supplementary data (App. Br. 11). We disagree with the Appellant. As
16 discussed *supra*, Partridge describes transmitting transaction data (FF 02).
17 The Examiner further found that Partridge describes transmitting additional
18 information, including TP, ESN, MIN1, MIN2, RAND, and AUTHR (Ans.
19 14). The Appellant has not provided any rationale as to why this
20 information is not supplemental information and how the claimed invention
21 is distinguished from this description of Partridge. As such, the Appellant's
22 argument is not found persuasive.

23 The Appellant additionally contends that (7) Partridge fails to describe
24 the step of terminating the transaction if the confirmation information is not
25 given within a predetermined time (App. Br. 11). We disagree with the
26 Appellant. Partridge describes that a transaction is completed once a

confirmation is transmitted to the customer and merchant (FF 02). That is, if a confirmation is not transmitted then the transaction is not completed. This suggests that if a customer is not approved for credit, then no confirmation is transmitted and the transaction is terminated. Since the termination of a transaction is suggested, the Appellant's argument is not found to be persuasive.

The Appellant also contends that (8) independent claims 18-19 recite limitations similar to independent claim 1 and Partridge fails to describe these limitations for the same reasons discussed *supra*. We disagree with the Appellant. The Appellant's arguments were not found to be persuasive *supra* and are not found persuasive here for the same reasons.

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Partridge and Jonstromer.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Examiner did not err in rejecting claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Partridge and Jonstromer.

DECISION

To summarize, our decision is as follows:

- The rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 12-19, and 22-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Partridge and Jonstromer is sustained.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection with this appeal may be extended under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(1)(iv).

AFFIRMED

mev

Address

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
IP Section
2323 Victory Avenue
Suite 700
Dallas TX 75219